DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 788 RC 004 428

TITLE	Seasonal Agricultural Labor in Oregon.
INSTITUTION	Oregon State Univ., Corvallis.
SPONS AGENCY	Oregon
PUB DATE	11 Dec 68
NOTE	50p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.60
DESCRIPTORS	*Agricultural Laborers, Early Childhood Education, Housing Deficiencies, Legislation, *Living Standards, *Migrant Child Education, Population Trends, Programs, Rural Education, *Seasonal Laborers, *Social Services
IDENTIFIERS	*Oregon

ABSTRACT

Requested by the governor of Oregon, this 1968 report focuses on seasonal agricultural labor in Oregon. The task force, appointed by the president of Oregon State University, reported on the following areas: (1) the problem in terms of potential unionization, population trends, existing state programs and agencies for the migrants; (2) regulations and factors pertaining to working conditions and contractual arrangements; (3) education; (4) shelter; (5) health services and nutrition; and (6) economics of crop production in Oregon. For each area studied, conclusions and recommendations are given. (LS)

ED040788

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SEASONAL AGRICULTURAL LABOR

in

OREGON

Task Force Report

Committee Appointed
by
Dr. J. H. Jensen, President
Oregon State University
as requested
by
The Honorable Tom McCall
Governor, State of Oregon

RC004428

11 December 1968

MEMBERSHIP OF TASK FORCE
(Oregon State University)

Carl L. Anderson, Head, Dept. of Hygiene and Environmental Sanitation

Manning H. Becker, Extension Farm Management Specialist

Emery N. Castle, Head, Department of Agricultural Economics

Wilbur T. Cooney, Dean of Agriculture

Lee R. Foster, County Extension Agent

Keith Goldhammer, Dean, School of Education

L. G. Harter, Chairman, Department of Economics

J. Philip O'Neill, Head, Department of Family Life

Ronald G. Petrie, Director of Teacher Corps and Upward Bound

Jackson Ross, Assistant Director, Cooperative Extension Service

TOM McCALL
GOVERNOR

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
STATE CAPITOL
SALEM 97310

February 17, 1969

Fellow Oregonians:

In this age of increasing affluence for most Oregonians, certain segments of the State's citizenry still live under conditions which preclude their participation in the mainstream of society. Handicapped by a lack of education, job skills, skin color, language barriers, and other cultural differences, these citizens live in poverty or find themselves alienated from the larger community.

State government must be responsive to the needs and problems of all citizens, no less to the poor or alienated than to the most affluent. To be otherwise, State government is not responsible nor is it acting compatibly with the democratic values and ideals of Oregon.

This document--the report of an Oregon State University Task Force--concerns itself with the problems of seasonal agricultural workers. A majority of these are Mexican-American and white migratory workers who need special attention from State government. However, the problems of seasonal agriculture are broader than any one group. They include the problems of growers and processors of agricultural products. So intrinsically interwoven are these problems that a response to the problems of one group necessitates a response to all involved groups.

I find myself in agreement with many of the recommendations, and I commend all of them to you for your careful consideration.

The issue is critical. The State has a responsibility to provide leadership and to share in resolving the issue during this legislative session. For this reason, I feel this report should be given the careful attention of legislators, governmental officials and the public. I would be particularly pleased to receive your comments regarding the contents and thrust of the report.

Tom McCall
Governor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Members of the Task Force were requested to undertake this study with some faint hope that all of the many related problems might be brought into a new perspective for understanding. Available time was all too short to permit a comprehensive assembly of related facts and an in-depth development of the many interrelationships that prevail. It was only through the help of many sincerely interested individuals that this Task Force was able to place in focus the areas of concern set forth in this report. Had time permitted, a much more comprehensive review would have been undertaken, thus making possible a reflection of thoughts of many more competent, interested and concerned citizens of the State of Oregon; many of whom have devoted much time and energy to the solution of related problems. For these omissions, members of the Task Force are indeed regretful and apologetic. On the other hand, the Task Force is sincerely indebted to the many individuals and representatives of organizations and agencies who were called upon for information which was so important in the deliberations that took place and much of the data assembled in the Appendix of this report. A special expression of gratitude is herewith extended to:

Peter J. Batten, M.D., Director, Marion County Health Department and staff

Melvin J. Conklin, Emeritus Professor of Agricultural Economics, Oregon State University

James B. Conroy, Supt., Klamath County School District, Klamath Falls, Oregon

Francis H. Dummer, Supt. of Schools, Dayton Public Schools, Dayton, Oregon

Mrs. Lois Epeneter, Occupational Health Section, Oregon State Board of Health

Governor Dan Evans, State of Washington

Richard E. Gardner, Curriculum Director, McMinnville Public Schools, McMinnville, Oregon

Robert L. Glasscock, Supt.-Principal, Gervais Union High School, Gervais

Marko L. Haggard, Coordinator, Oregon Economic Opportunity Programs

Robert M. Hanson, Supt. of Schools, Culver School District #4, Culver, Oregon

Hugh Hartman, Supt., Redmond Public Schools, Redmond, Oregon

Edward Hawes, Chief, Wage and Hour Inspector, Oregon State Bureau of Labor

Mike Irons, Supt. of Schools, Ontario Public Schools, Ontario, Oregon

Mrs. Sonja Kollias, Occupational Health Section, Oregon State Board of Health

John Little, Director of Valley Migrant League, Woodburn, Oregon

Wayne McMurray, Supt. of Schools, Central School District #13J, Independence, Oregon

W. L. McPartland, Supt., Nyssa Public Schools, Nyssa, Oregon

Elton Minkler, Migrant Program Director, State Department of Education, Salem, Oregon

M. L. Morey, Supt., Marion County Intermediate Education District, Salem, Oregon

Mrs. Jean Peters, Acting Head, Department of Foods and Nutrition, School of Home Economics, Oregon State University

Mrs. Hester Poareo, Occupational Health Section, Oregon State Board of Health

Ventura Rios, President, United Farm Workers in Oregon

Taylor Sandvigen, Supervising Sanatarian, Occupational Health Section, Oregon State Board of Health

L. P. Sydow, Supt., North Marion School District #15, Aurora, Oregon

Philip Tanton, Acting Regional Director, U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security

Louis G. Terkla, D.M.D., Dean, University of Oregon Dental School, Portland, Oregon

Robert W. Warner, Supt., North Plains Elementary School, North Plains, Oregon

Lane Williams, Education Director of Valley Migrant League, Woodburn, Oregon

Joseph D. Wilson, Supervisor, Rural Manpower Services, Oregon State Employment Service

Staff Members, Department of Family Life, School of Home Economics,
Oregon State University

Occupational Health Section, Oregon State Board of Health

Migrant Branch, Office of Economic Opportunity, Washington, D. C.

Office of Education, Migrant Program Division, Washington, D. C.

PREFACE

Upon request of the Honorable Tom McCall, Governor, State of Oregon, a task force composed of ten members of the faculty, Oregon State University, was appointed on August 27, 1968, by President James H. Jensen to identify and consider state-wide problems associated with seasonal agricultural employees in Oregon and, where appropriate, suggest potential solutions. The task force was requested to give particular attention in its studies to the following areas of concern:

A. Working conditions and contractual arrangements.

B. Education, nutrition, shelter and health care, and

C. The timely harvesting of crops in an economically feasible manner.

The task force was mindful throughout its studies and findings of the plight of workers in providing a meaningful life for themselves and members of their families. At the same time those involved in this study were equally aware of their responsibility to the people of Oregon in the development of recommendations that, if followed, would provide assurance that crops could and would be harvested and delivered to processors in the best of condition and within the realm of economic feasibility.

To a person, the greatest regret of members of this task force was that time did not permit an in-depth study of this extremely significant segment of the economic and sociological problems confronting the citizens of this State. The best that could be accomplished was to identify, with some degree of understanding and clarity, relevant problems, evaluate available resources, and propose some reasonable approaches to their solution.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	THE PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE	
	The Agricultural Industry in Oregon	1
	Potential Unionization	2
	Trends in Seasonal Agricultural Labor	3
	Problems of Seasonal Agricultural Workers	4
	Problems of Employers of Seasonally Employed Agricultural Workers	5
	Existing State Programs and Agencies	5
	Conclusions	7
	Recommendations	7
II.	REGULATIONS AND FACTORS PERTAINING TO WORKING CONDITIONS AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS	
	Working Conditions	9
	Contractual Arrangements	10
	The Situation and Existing Problems	10
	Role of the Contractor	10
	Federal and State Regulations	11
	Conclusions	12
	Recommendations	12
III.	EDUCATION	
	Survey of the Situation	13
	Funding	14
	Long Range Planning	15
	Teacher Training	15
	Curriculum Development	16
	Basic Research	16
	Preschool Education	17
	The Situation and Existing Problems	17
	Suggestions Arising from Other Efforts to Service and Educate Subcultural and Minority Groups	18
	Conclusions	18
	Recommendations	20
IV.	SHELTER	
	The Situation	23
	Recommendations	26
V.	HEALTH SERVICES AND NUTRITION	
	The Situation and Existing Problems	28
	Conclusions	29
	Recommendations	29
	Nutrition	31
	Conclusions	32
	Recommendations	33

Page

VI. THE ECONOMICS OF CROP PRODUCTION IN OREGON. 34

Conclusions 36

APPENDIX

I - 1 Estimated Labor Force in Oregon 1.1
I - 2 Estimated Seasonal Hired Farm Work Force Employed on June 15, 1958 through 1968 by Type of Worker. 1.2
I - 3 Estimated Seasonal Hired Farm Work Force Employed on June 30, 1958 through 1968 by Type of Worker. 1.3
I - 4 Estimated Seasonal Hired Farm Work Force Employed August 15, 1958 through 1968 by Type of Worker. 1.4

II - 1 Migrant Farm Labor Contractors. . . . . 2.1 (State of Oregon, Bureau of Labor)
II - 2 Title 29 - Labor - Federal Register, December 22, 1964 and November 22, 1966 . . . . . 2.6
II - 3 Migrant Farm Labor Contractors - ORS 658.405 to 658.455 . . . . . 2.11

IV - 1 Comparison of Federal and Oregon State Standards Relating to Farm Camps. 4.1
IV - 2 California Report 4.22

VI - 1 Prices Received by Growers for Selected Crops Using Seasonal Labor. 6.1
VI - 2 Acreage and Production Data for Strawberries. 6.2
VI - 3 Acreage and Production Data for Snap Beans. 6.3
VI - 4 Acreage and Production Data for Prunes and Plums. 6.4
VI - 5 Acreage and Production Data for Red Raspberries, Blackberries (tame), and Caneberries (others) 6.5
VI - 6 Acreage and Production Data for Cherries - Sweet and Sour . 6.6
VI - 7 Acreage and Production Data for Pears 6.7
VI - 8 Acreage and Production Data for Apples. 6.8
VI - 9 Strawberries, All Farms, Oregon, by Value of Sales, 1959 and 1964 . . . . . 6.9
VI -10 Number of Commercial Vegetable Farms, Oregon, by Value of Sales, 1959 and 1964 . . . . . 6.10
VI -11 Number of Commercial Fruit and Nut Farms, Oregon, by Value of Sales, 1959 and 1964 . . . . . 6.11
VI -12 Vegetables Harvested for Sale - Oregon 6.12
VI -13 Tree Fruits, Nuts and Grapes Harvested for Sale - Oregon. . 6.13

DELETED

I. THE PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE

The Agricultural Industry in Oregon

The economy of Oregon continues to depend heavily on the natural resource-oriented industries. In this context, agriculture is and will continue to be an area of major importance. The farmers and growers of the state produce commodities valued in excess of 500 million dollars annually. Value added in processing amounts to more than half this amount. Farmers, in turn, spend most of the gross income they receive to purchase the inputs and the labor needed in production.

Agriculture is a seasonal industry. In most instances the biological process of growing plants and animals depends upon climate and seasons. Only with certain commodities, such as broilers, has the natural environment been controlled to the point where the seasons no longer have a marked impact on production. Therefore, most agricultural products require seasonal agricultural labor. The adjustment to this seasonal requirement varies greatly by crop. In some instances the seasonal labor is supplied by the farmer and his family. In other cases, the farmer hires people on a yearly basis and plans the farm tasks so that seasonal and non-seasonal labor demands come at different times during the year. This is not possible, of course, with all crop and livestock enterprises. Some have very high seasonal labor demands, and a labor force employed on the farm annually would make production uneconomic.

Examples of crops with high seasonal labor requirements are snap beans, strawberries, cherries, and pears. In total, these crops constitute a significant portion of the total agricultural production of the state. They also tend to generate more subsequent economic activity than do those products that do not require much additional processing. Oregon agriculture supports, directly and indirectly, an annual payroll well in excess of 100,000 workers. About one-fourth of these are employed in the processing industries.

The total non-agricultural labor force has increased from 567,000 workers in 1958 to an estimated 757,100 workers in 1967. During this same period, the agricultural labor force has decreased from 76,700 to 60,200. The decline in the number of agricultural workers has taken place nearly every year. The rate of decline in Oregon is somewhat less than the national rate (Appendix I-1).

Nationally, farm wages rose 85% from 1950 to 1966. In 1950 farm labor made up 40% of the total inputs in agriculture. It is estimated that in 1966 the labor input contributed only 19% of the total input in agriculture. Considerable variation in the change in labor productivity exists between various kinds of crops. For example, during the above-mentioned period, the production per man hour of labor used to produce feed grains increased 300%, while labor productivity in fruits and nuts, and vegetable production, increased only 23% and 74% respectively. In the

case of strawberries, a crop which is still hand-harvested, labor costs are estimated to be approximately 70% of the cost of production at the present time. This is about the same as shown in the study of production costs made in 1947. Labor constitutes approximately 10-15% of the cost of producing bush beans which are mechanically harvested, as compared with about 65-70% for hand-picked pole beans.

In summary, the agricultural industry is an important one to the state's economy. The welfare of many people, including, but not limited to, growers and seasonal agricultural workers, is involved. It is a legitimate problem for state-wide concern for at least two reasons. One is that the economic well-being of the state is involved. The other is that, for humanitarian reasons, the welfare of any group becomes of concern to the whole of society. The remainder of this report will emphasize the particular problems of seasonal workers and growers. The concerns of the public generally will not be treated in explicit detail. Nevertheless, this concern is very real and is implied by the very existence of the Task Force and the report itself. Many of the recommendations will have meaning only in the light of this broad social concern.

We believe a satisfactory social solution to the problem is possible only if it is viewed in this way. Many problems cannot be solved by either growers or workers, acting independently or even jointly. The worker may be concerned with better wages, better nutrition, better health care, and better shelter. While the grower may not be concerned with these items in the abstract, making them available to the workers may reduce his income. In the face of the tremendous decline in number of farms, he may recognize that making the above items available to workers threatens the existence of his business. The plight of many workers, in connection with their employment, is matched by the precarious economic position of many growers.

Potential Unionization

Unionization of farm workers may present another challenge to the growers. At present the United Farm Workers of Oregon represent but a handful of workers in the state. The few organizers face an overwhelming job in attempting to unionize the scattered and shifting seasonal workers. Unless the federal law should be changed to provide farm workers with the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, or the farmers, themselves, provide the organizers with an emotional issue, the danger of unionization is not very great. The state could contribute to the creation of such an issue. Failure to maintain adequate housing standards, effective education, or reasonable working conditions could conceivably furnish the necessary provocation.

If workers were organized on a sufficiently massive scale and the growers were organized along parallel lines, both workers and growers might benefit. Their combined bargaining power against processors and the consumers could raise the incomes of both farmers and workers. But to be effective their organizations would have to encompass the entire market areas in which their products were produced and sold.

Development of comprehensive unionism of seasonal agricultural workers in the foreseeable future does not appear likely. Instead, there may be some turmoil without reasonable prospects of a satisfactory resolution of the conflicts. Some growers may face disruption of their labor forces at critical harvest periods. Yet much of the disturbance can be prevented by providing reasonable standards of treatment for seasonal workers. This report provides some guidance toward establishing such standards.

Trends in Seasonal Agricultural Labor

The estimated number of seasonal agricultural workers in Oregon for three periods during the summer from 1958 through 1968 were obtained from the Oregon State Department of Employment (Appendix I-2). The three periods studied were June 15, June 30 and August 15 since these are the dates when the largest number of seasonal agricultural workers are employed in Oregon.

Intrastate migrants, on the average, constituted approximately four percent of the total seasonal work force for these periods. Average numbers of workers during the 11 years was 2,722.

Interstate seasonal workers during the 11 years averaged 20 percent of the total seasonal work force for these periods. However, the actual number of interstate workers employed varies considerably from one summer period to another and from one year to another.

The range is from a low number of interstate workers on June 15, 1964 of 5,790 to a high of 20,135 on June 30, 1967. In 1968 the number of interstate seasonal workers employed in Oregon dropped in each of the three periods. The most dramatic drop was in the June 30 period when the number declined from 20,135 in 1967 to 10,970. The June 15 count showed a decline from 11,120 in 1967 to 10,235 in 1968, a reduction of 885 workers. On August 15, the decline was from 13,460 to 10,975, a reduction of 2,485 workers.

By comparison local seasonal agricultural workers, those workers who commute from their homes to their places of employment each day during the eleven year period, accounted for approximately 76 percent of the total seasonal workers. The actual number of these workers also varies considerably from year to year and from one summer period to another.

Numbers of Local Seasonal Agricultural Workers
By Selected Periods

	1966	1967	1968
June 15	56,830	51,575	50,825
June 30	54,465	61,785	64,055
August 15	57,415	52,535	55,380

The highest number of local seasonal workers employed occurred during the June 30, 1964 period when 73,475 were reported.

Problems of Seasonal Agricultural Workers

Seasonal workers are composed of people from several ethnic groups and from different cultural and economic situations. Included in the seasonal farm labor force are Spanish Americans, Mexicans, Negroes, Anglos and Indians. Most of these workers seek employment in agriculture throughout the year. However, there are some who are only interested in part time employment on farms - such as retired persons, vacationers and temporary unemployed. Thus no list of problems applies to all seasonal workers. However, the following are problems that do confront many seasonal workers and their families.

1. A limited education is a problem of many, thus they have limited opportunities for employment and are vulnerable to possible exploitation by unscrupulous persons. Many of the Spanish Americans are also handicapped by the inability to speak English to any extent.

2. Low annual income plagues many workers. Proper management of existing income also deserves attention.

3. Large families of many workers places additional stress on their financial situation and further reduces the educational opportunities of the children.

4. Seasonal work opportunities and the changing location of work opportunities requires a great deal of travel by seasonal workers, thus increasing their expenses, and reducing opportunities for the education of children.

5. Often there is a lack of employment for several days after seasonal workers arrive in a community due to the fact that farm work is not yet available.

6. Alcoholism handicaps many workers reducing their employability, their earnings, and their health.

7. Although medical programs are available to seasonal workers many do not take advantage of such programs or follow through with recommended medical treatments. Dental problems are likewise quite numerous among seasonal workers and members of their families.

8. Attitudes, temperament, work habits, responsibility of workers often results in unemployment.

9. Inadequate housing for families of seasonal agricultural workers is often a problem. When adequate housing is provided, some workers do not know how to use and care for modern facilities.

10. Seasonal workers frequently find it difficult to secure legal counsel to protect their rights and interests.

Problems of Employers of Seasonally Employed Agricultural Workers

Seasonal workers are needed to work in growing and harvesting many agricultural crops. Approximately 60,000 such workers find employment in the agricultural industry of Oregon. Agricultural employers are confronted with many problems when employing such workers.

These include:

1. Providing adequate housing, especially for families, is expensive - particularly in view of the amount of time that such housing is used during the year.

2. Often workers damage housing facilities and equipment which results in repairs and thus discourages employers from attempting to provide good housing.

3. Alcoholism often leads to friction in the farm labor camp, inefficient work habits and other social ills.

4. The wanderlust of many workers who work for a few days and decide to go to another area creates additional work for the employer in recruiting workers, filling out payrolls, etc.

5. Employers often advance travel money for seasonal workers, bail them out of jail, take them to the doctor, advance grocery money, etc.

6. The uncertainty of the availability of qualified workers is a fear and concern of many farmers.

7. The inability of employers to add increasing labor costs to the price of agricultural commodities makes it economically difficult to increase wages of farm workers.

8. Since many seasonal agricultural workers are either inexperienced or just inefficient workers, it often becomes necessary to employ a larger crew than would otherwise be required.

9. The perishability of many agricultural crops places the employer at the mercy of the elements and any other factors that delay harvest.

Existing State Programs and Agencies

The following agencies and groups now conduct or have conducted in the past significant programs, directly or indirectly related to seasonally employed agricultural workers:

State Departments of:

Agriculture	Labor
Education	Motor Vehicles
Employment	Welfare
Health	Workmen's Compensation Board

County or Area Agencies (Federal and State)

Community Action Agencies (Office of Economic Opportunity)
Farmers Home Administration
School Districts
State Departments of Employment, Health and Welfare

Colleges and Universities

Community Colleges and other institutions of higher education, public and private

Others

Farm Bureau Federation
Growers' Associations
Migrant Ministry, Oregon Council of Churches
United Farm Workers of Oregon
Valley Migrant League
Volunteers in Vanguard Action (VIVA)
Catholic Welfare Agencies
Archdiocese of Portland
Stella Maris House

Each agency or group, for all practical purposes, conducts its program independently and is not required or called upon to coordinate its efforts with others engaged in programs related to the same clientele. As might be expected in such a situation, there is considerable conflict of interest and duplication of effort. For example, labor camps are officially inspected by local health officials, representatives of the State Board of Health, the State Employment Service, the Labor Department and, when Federal funding is involved, by the Farmers Home Administration and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Unofficial visits and inspections of camps are made by many other groups such as the United Farm Workers, the Migrant Ministry, Valley Migrant League, Volunteers In Vanguard Action and others. State, Federal and County agencies have been assigned responsibility to administer certain programs related to seasonally employed agricultural workers but it is a piecemeal approach with little likelihood of making any lasting impact on the many problems facing seasonal agricultural workers and their employers.

The 1959 Legislature created a state Interagency Committee on Migratory Labor in an effort to provide some coordination of state agency work in this field. The committee was extended by the 1963 Legislature to January 1, 1968 when it was disbanded.

Conclusions

1. There is considerable duplication among the existing state and federal agencies. There is a need to coordinate the efforts of the myriad of agencies and groups engaged in this work.

2. No state agency has the responsibility of viewing the problems of seasonal agricultural workers on a general integrated basis.

3. There are problems confronting seasonal agricultural workers that are not treated by any existing state agency.

4. Many seasonal agricultural workers are being served by the private sector.

Recommendations

That a Seasonal Agricultural Workers Affairs Board be created.

1. There would be created a Seasonal Agricultural Workers Affairs Board, consisting of seven members appointed by the Governor, subject to approval by the Senate by a two-thirds vote.

2. Each member will be appointed for a term of four years except that when the Board is first appointed, one shall serve for one year, two for two years, two for three years, and two for four years from the date of appointment.

3. Two of the members shall be representative of seasonal agricultural workers, two shall be representative of growers, and three shall be public members. They should elect their chairman and vice-chairman from their own members. A majority of the Board constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.

4. The Board will serve without compensation, except for covering of expenses incurred in the performance of official duties.

5. The Board shall proceed as rapidly as possible to:

   A. Study the problems of seasonal agricultural workers in Oregon, identify existing state programs for the solution of these problems, note duplication among programs as well as conflicting programs, and identify gaps in existing programs.

   B. Make such studies available to all affected state agencies, to interested Federal Agencies, and the public generally.

   C. Provide all state agencies, and the public generally, an opportunity to be heard on the subject of said studies.

D. It is to be understood that all state programs affecting the health, housing, education, working conditions, and general welfare of seasonal agricultural workers shall be included as being subject to study by the Board.

6. Based upon the studies referred to above, the comments made on such studies, the Board shall formulate an integrated and coordinated set of policies for seasonal agricultural workers which shall govern the administration and activities of all state agencies involved in regulatory or service functions related to seasonal agricultural labor, subject to the conditions and provisions outlined below. Such policies will have the force of law and will be binding on all other state agencies.

7. The Board shall not have the power to set aside, modify, or change any act of the Legislature, unless this is expressly provided for in the legislation creating the Board.

8. The Board shall not have the power to supervise the internal affairs of any state agency, except it shall have the power to eliminate duplication and conflict among functions of agencies and to adjudicate conflicts which arise between state agencies or between such agencies and client groups.

9. The Board shall not have the power to interfere with, or influence the bargaining between grower and worker <u>except</u>, when a third party contractor is involved, the Board shall have the authority to require that the terms of the contract be filed with the Board and be made available to any interested party.

10. The Board may employ an Executive Secretary and, at its discretion, employ such other personnel as necessary to facilitate in carrying out its functions. The Board shall fix and pay the compensation of the Executive Secretary and other personnel; employment and compensation are subject to the State Civil Service Law, except when temporary scientific or professional personnel are required.

II. REGULATIONS AND FACTORS PERTAINING TO WORKING CONDITIONS AND CONTRACTUAL ARRANGEMENTS

Working Conditions

Farm workers come under Social Security coverage if they earn $150 or more from one employer, or work 20 days at hourly or daily cash wages during a calendar year. Disability and old age benefits accrue to the worker.

Farm employees are not covered by Unemployment Compensation.

Farm laborers may be covered by Workmens Compensation. Workmens Compensation became mandatory in Oregon on January 1, 1968, if the farm employer had a payroll of over $1,500 in 1967. The plan is optional for other farm employers. The employee is covered in case of injury, partial or complete disability, or death. Payments are made toward hospital and doctor bills and for loss of time.

The 1966 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act extended minimum wage protection to certain farm employees, including minors, whose employer in any calendar quarter of the preceding calendar year used more than 500 man days of agricultural labor. Such employees, unless otherwise exempt, must be paid at least $1.00 an hour, beginning February 1, 1967; $1.15 an hour beginning February 1, 1968; and $1.30 an hour beginning February 1, 1969. There are no overtime requirements.

All employees must be paid at least the minimum described above, except the following four groups, who need not be paid the minimum:

1. Members of your own immediate family.

2. Local, daily commuting, hand harvest pieceworkers, providing they did not work over 13 weeks in agriculture during the preceding calendar year.

3. Children of migrants who have not yet reached their 17th birthday, provided they are employed in hand harvest piecework, on the same farm as their parents, or person standing in the place of the parent, and provided they are paid the same piece rate as other piece rate workers on the farm.

4. Employees engaged in the production of range livestock.

Minors 16 years of age or over may be employed in agriculture at any time in any job. Children under 16 may not be employed in an agricultural occupation declared hazardous by the Secretary of Labor. Children under 16 may not be employed in agriculture during school hours. (This means that if school is open in the place where you take your workers, the children may not work during the hours the school is open.)

Contractual Arrangements

The Situation and Existing Problems.

A. The role of the contractor. Many Oregon farmers use labor contractors to recruit for them and to handle for them their workers. These contractors deliver to them workers from Texas, Arizona, and California in time to meet the growers' needs. They do this without any written contracts which would be enforced in court. If they fail to deliver the necessary workers, the grower has but little recourse. He must find other sources of labor before he loses his crop. The lack of written contracts may also harm the contractors and their workers. After traveling a long distance, the members of a crew may discover the grower has made other arrangements. They may lose valuable time before finding alternative employment.

When contractors bring their crews, they supervise the work and relieve the growers of many of the responsibilities normally borne by employers. Contractors serve as the actual employers of many of the farm workers. The growers pay them lump sums for the labor done on their farms. From these sums the contractors pay wages to the workers. As employers, the contractors are responsible for maintaining payroll records, withholding, income and Social Security taxes, and payroll taxes.

The worker depends upon the contractor for many things. The contractor finds him jobs at a series of farms each year. Seldom does any worker possess any written contract with the contractor. He must depend upon verbal promises made to him. If the worker needs money for food during the slack season, or for transportation to work, the contractor will make him a loan. Often such loans are made without any interest, but interest payments can be substantial. The absence of interest does not necessarily mean that loans are interest-free, because the contractor is able to manipulate wage rates enough to compensate for the lack of any declared interest. At the very least, the existence of such debt ties the worker to the contractor until it is paid. Contractors also often provide their crew members with transportation. They may or may not charge for this service. Often the contractor will arrange with local merchants to provide credit for the workers. Sometimes contractors will receive compensation for this from the merchant. At times the contractors provide recreation opportunities in the form of gambling and other illegal activities.

In the absence of other institutional arrangements, the labor contractor provides essential services for both the grower and the worker. But the extreme dependence of the worker upon the contractor provides openings for abuses. The contractor may be the warm friend of the worker, and indeed, at times is a relative, but he may be an exploiter of labor. He has been described as a "merchant of misery".

The Legislative Interim Committee on Migrant Labor, created in 1957, found in their investigations evidence of abuses by the labor contractors. Consequently, the committee recommended legislation requiring licensing of contractors. In 1959, the legislation included such requirements in its legislation on migrant labor. Eight other states also require contractors to be licensed. The Commissioner of Labor in each of the eight states except Nevada carries the responsibility for granting the licenses and policing the activities of the contractors. Under the authority of the Farm Labor Contractor Registration Act of 1963, all labor contractors who recruit, furnish, or transport ten or more migrant workers for interstate employment, must register with the U. S. Secretary of Labor.

B. Federal and State regulations. The State of Oregon distinguishes between a crew leader and a contractor. The 1959 legislation specified that crew leaders must be registered, while contractors must be licensed. Legislation in 1961 eliminated the registration requirement for crew leaders. Six of the eight states with laws regulating labor contractors make no distinction between crew leaders and contractors. Federal law does not make this distinction either. It does not specifically mention crew leaders. Presumedly if they perform the function of a labor contractor, they must be licensed, unless they are full-time or regular employees of a grower, of a processor, or of some other organizations. (See Appendix II-1 for Oregon law, and Appendix II-2 for the federal law.

The Chief Wage and Hour Inspector in Oregon reports that crew leaders can operate almost as though they were contractors, and at the same time escape regulation. As long as a crew leader does not pay the workers directly, he is not required to be licensed. The Chief Inspector adds that a crew leader may recruit out-of-state or in the state. The crew leader recruiting out-of-state escapes state regulation, but he is required to register with the U. S. Department of Labor. Crew leaders may also engage in such questionable practices as pirating crews away from licensed contractors or growers. They may make impossible promises and mislead the workers. As long as they do not violate some law, they can not be barred from activities, even though harmful to workers and growers.

The federal law regulating contractors is more comprehensive in its protection of workers. Under federal law, licenses can be revoked if a labor contractor fails to post in a conspicuous place the terms of employment or the terms of occupancy of housing. It can also be revoked if the contractor fails to keep the proper payroll records or fails to furnish the worker with an itemized statement of his wages and all deductions. He can also lose his license if his liability insurance lapses on vehicles in which he transports workers.

Conclusions

Oregon law fails to match the standards of the federal law. By differentiating between a contractor and a crew leader who can perform most of the same functions, some of the law's purposes are frustrated.

Oregon law also fails to provide the worker protection against arbitrary treatment from the contractor. Because he lacks a written contract, the worker must depend upon the verbal promises of the contractor. Such dependence opens the way for considerable abuses on the part of contractors, such as the breaking of promises or engaging in unfair discrimination. While the requiring of written contracts may not be practical, open disclosure of the terms of employment will reduce the opportunities for abuse.

Recommendations

The Task Force recommends that the State of Oregon substantially adopt the federal standards. In doing so, the state will reduce confusion resulting from the existence of two standards. It will also demonstrate that it is not in competition to maintain lower than reasonable standards. For a proposed draft of the necessary legislation, see Appendix II-3.

The Task Force recommends that state laws on labor contractors be amended to agree substantially with this federal law, Public Law 88-582, 88th Congress, S. 524, September 7, 1964. The use of the federal definitions would eliminate the distinctions between labor contractor and crew leader. Following the federal provisions would also require labor contractors to disclose their wage bargains, post them in conspicuous places, keep adequate payroll records, and furnish workers with statements as to their earnings and payroll deductions. Most of the problems involving the regulation of labor contractors would be met if the federal and state regulations were the same.

III. EDUCATION

Survey of the Situation

On September 24, 1968, a letter was sent out to sixteen school districts which were identified by the State Department of Education as having operated migrant programs in the 1967-68 school year. These school districts were asked to respond to a questionnaire concerning the problems of migrant education in their districts. They were asked to answer or respond to the following questions:

1. The number of migrant students in school by grade level.

2. The months of the school year in which the migrants were there; and the variations of the load experienced through the year.

3. The particular problems associated with the education of migrant children.

4. The kinds of special education programs and services that were provided by the district and how these were financed.

5. The alternatives to the present state and local programs and suggestions for the improvement in the financing and conduct of education programs for migrant children.

The districts that were asked to respond to the survey were Woodburn, Redmond, North Plains, Nyssa, North Marion, Marion County I.E.D., McMinnville, Klamath County, Gervis, Dayton, Culver, Central District #13J, Butte Creek, Brooks, Adrian and Ontario. Twelve of the sixteen districts replied.

An analysis of the responses from the school superintendents who had migrant programs for the 1967-68 school year reveals some basic problems with some hints of possible solutions to these problems. The basic problems which have been identified are:

1. Funding.

2. The need for long range planning.

3. Teacher training

   A. Initial training of beginning teachers.

   B. Continuous in-service programs for teachers on the job.

4. Curriculum developments.

5. Basic research.

In addition to these five basic areas of need there was also an expression of the types of education programs that were in existence and/or needed. These include:

1. Continuation and expansion of such preschool programs as Head Start.

2. Continuation and expansion of parent and adult education programs (either in concurrence with the preschool program or separate from the preschool program).

3. Continuation and expansion of adult education similar to that which is currently being supplied through the Valley Migrant League, Department of Employment, and the Manpower Development and Training Act.

4. Continuation and expansion of day care programs (in summer and perhaps during the regular school year).

5. Development of more specialized high school programs to keep migrant students in school and enable them to help pay their way (such as the Work Experience Program).

6. Develop more programs in vocational and technical education.

Funding

The most consistent remark in the questionnaire related to funding procedures of the previous year. It appears that the State Emergency Board limited the amount of money that the State Department of Education could receive from Federal sources under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to about two-thirds of what was available for the year. This, in turn, caused local school districts to cut back their programs and limit the services that they could have provided to migrant children.

Some of the districts expressed the concern that there was too much politics involved in the decision and that there were members of the State Emergency Board who were unreceptive to the plight and problems of migrant workers and their children. This is a feeling expressed by the respondees which may or may not be substantiated in the actual facts of why the funds were restricted.

It appears that the restriction of funds has to do with the state fiscal policy more than it does any personal whim of the members of the Emergency Board who might be unsympathetic to the migrants in the state. Additional checking reveals, for example, that other departments were cut in the same way that the Migrant Education section was. However, such action does raise a question about the desirability of limiting acceptance and/or use of funds when such funds, in fact, are available from sources other than general state funds.

Long Range Planning

The problems of long range planning are tied in with the problems of funding and the lack of commitment of the legislature and the state as a whole. If the Migrant Education program is to become effective it must have some planning which would identify long range goals and objectives and proceed in the direction of those goals. Information indicates that migrants will be rapidly replaced through automation, mechanization, and hybridization of farm crops. Consequently, it is imperative that children and adults be prepared for some other worthy type of financial endeavor to support themselves. Otherwise, the burden of responsibility will fall upon the welfare roles of the state.

In years past the state endeavored to develop a program to insure that children were involved and integrated effectively into the public schools of the state, and a ten year plan was established for that purpose. It appears that the State Department of Education could follow a similar vein at the present time and establish a five or a ten year plan with some specific stated objective as to where the State of Oregon should be in migrant education at the end of that time.

Without such a plan and without some commitment on the part of the Department of Education as well as the legislative bodies, it becomes clear that very little, if anything, of constructive long range value will take place. The department's "five year plan" needs to be incorporated into a state "migrant master plan" to be meaningful and effective.

Teacher Training

Teacher training for migrant education has been sporadic and inadequate. The State Department of Education provided some in-service training from 1959 through 1963 and discontinued migrant education from 1963 through 1965. The State Department of Education has been providing some types of in-service training programs throughout the last two years of the migrant program in the State of Oregon. In addition, the Department has provided some funding for Eastern Oregon College of Education to provide a training program for teachers of migrant children. The selection of Eastern Oregon College of Education to provide this training program appears to be based upon factors other than what the facts seem to bear out relating to migrant education problems of the state. Eastern Oregon College of Education is a great distance away from the main migrant population of the State of Oregon and is able to effectively serve only a small part of the migrant population of the state. If teacher training is to be effective, it will require the inclusion of special teacher training programs with other institutions of higher learning in the state, particularly those which are in greater proximity to the migrant problem and which have the staff and resources necessary to carry on an effective training program.

Initial Training - It appears that it will be necessary for the immediate future to train new people in undergraduate training programs who will have the skills to work effectively in migrant education. It is suggested that more than one institution become involved in providing this type of initial training program.

The Teacher Corps program at Oregon State University has a migrant education specialty built into the program. This could be expanded to include more than is presently being provided. It is possible that the Department of Education could provide some additional financing to expand the program within the state institutions.

In-service Training - There needs to be continual on-going in-service training for teachers of migrant children. This in-service training can best be developed through financial assistance from the State Department to one or more universities who in turn would provide the technical assistance necessary to districts that have migrant children.

Curriculum Development

Migrant children have a multiplicity of problems when they enter the public schools. One of the biggest problems is the lack of curriculum materials which meet their own unique educational needs. By and large, most materials are designed for middle class children from middle class homes. Consequently, the vocabulary and culture of most of the curriculum materials is irrelevant and incomprehensible for many migrant children. Considering the problem of general curriculum deficiencies, the problem of language deficiencies and differences, one can readily see that migrant education programs require the development of a specialized curriculum.

Information indicates that some curriculum development has been attempted at the local and state level. More comprehensive and extensive development of curriculum materials should be one of the major objectives of the State Department of Education program. Hopefully the department would utilize the services of expertise at the university level where they exist, as well as explore the utilization of materials which have already been developed in other states.

Basic Research

The Migrant Education program has been plagued by a lack of objective research since its inception. Most of the research available concerning migrant children is subjective and descriptive. For example, very little research has been done on the differences of language development and patterns of white migrants as compared to white residents. Certainly, if there is a difference in the language structure and usage, such information would be valuable in terms of instructional methods used in the curriculum developed for white migrant children. Without comprehensive basic research, the result evokes the adage "the blind leading the blind". Almost everyone will concede that Spanish American youngsters have language problems (as they relate to speaking and using English), but how much work has

really been done to evaluate effectively the effects of migrant culture on assimilation into the mainstream of American life. There appears to be much description, and much emotionalism, but few real facts.

What types of coordinated research have been done between the various departments concerning the overall migrant program? We know that the Employment Department develops statistics as does the Education Department. But a truly comprehensive research program is lacking. No agency has formulated a perspective of the information that is both pertinent and essential to improve the existing state of affairs.

It seems that there is a vast gap in the area of basic research related to the problems of migrant children and adults and coordinated research between public agencies and the private sector.

Preschool Education

A. The situation and existing problems.

At this time there are no agencies fundamentally involved with education programs for preschool migrant children. Public school systems in Oregon do not concern themselves with preschool education and although preschool teachers are trained in the state, they are hampered in their contribution by lack of certification. The Valley Migrant League did direct some attention to preschool programs and apparently made good progress in the few years of its service. This service no longer exists, and, consequently, with the exception of those few migrant preschoolers who are enrolled by local Community Action Agencies sponsoring Head Start Child Development Centers, an organized program is totally lacking. Ideally, any program development should be directly linked to the overall public school educational program. However, under the present system some major problems may exist in such a linkage, e.g. funding may become more complex in that preschool units are not at this time an integral part of the public school system.

A more specific example of the problem would be that the Migrant Amendment to Title I funds does not permit expenditures for "Day Care" services or "Adult Education". This restriction is the most often cited reason for the dearth of preschool programs. However, it should be stressed here that "Day Care" services in the usually accepted sense is not what is needed. Rather, an education program is called for, to serve these children in the same manner as the Child Development Center serves Project Head Start. Successful funding has been accomplished in a few areas, but close cooperation between school districts and Community Action Agencies is necessary and even then the programs have usually been called Head Start Programs. Successful operation of programs, however, is even less frequent. One major obstacle is that many school superintendents will hire only certified teachers and this means

that the best trained teacher is not even considered for the job. Hiring of the professionally trained preschool teacher seems absolutely imperative for two reasons. First, it would greatly increase the probability of operating successful educational programs and, second, it would allow the simultaneous operation of parent education programs in conjunction with the children's program. The success of these professionals in both areas is well-documented by performance in Head Start Programs over the last four years.

B. Analyses of other efforts to service and educate sub-cultural and minority groups would suggest that:

1. The preschool period is a most fertile time to inaugurate attempts to offset the effects of various forms of deprivation.

2. Work with young children needs reinforcement from the home and this necessitates parent education programs.

3. Parent education programs should be run in conjunction with the preschool program and its staff rather than separate as an adult education effort might be run.

4. In the parent education programs, the mother should be the target person since she probably exerts more influence on spending patterns, eating patterns, hygiene routines and general orientation to school for the younger children.

5. Placement of these young children in programs would alleviate the problem of older school age children not attending their classes because of babysitting responsibilities.

Conclusions

A. Funding.

There appears to be reasonable funding for migrant programs in the State of Oregon if the resources that are available are utilized. For example, there is approximately one million dollars available under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Migrant Amendment. One-third of this amount was not expended because of ruling on the part of the State Emergency Board. This, on the surface, appears to be very unfortunate.

There are funds available under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Migrant Amendment; funds available through the Valley Migrant League; The Office of Economic Opportunity; (Head Start; Community Action), plus other public and private sources. The funding available appears to be enough, if properly supervised and applied for, to run at least a good minimum program for the education of migrant children and adults.

B. Planning.

At the present time the overall migrant education program is piecemeal and haphazard, though well-intentioned. This is brought about by a multitude of factors including the fiscal policy of the state and lack of total commitment to the problems.

C. Teacher Training.

Teacher training aspects of migrant education need to be expanded considerably beyond their present level. New teachers need to be encouraged to become involved and committed to working with migrants over a long period of time. In addition, there needs to be constant retraining and in-service training of teachers in the field concerning the problems of migrant children.

D. Curriculum Development.

Although there has been some development of specialized curriculum it appears to be piecemeal and not totally comprehensive. Migrant education requires the development of innovative and creative materials. These materials should be coordinated as to their relevance with other parts of the country where migrant programs are in effect.

E. Preschool Education.

1. Sponsors of every broadly based educational approach to subcultural or minority group problems expounds on the need to reach the young in these groups by preschool education programs.

2. None of the existing educational or migrant agencies is responsible for education of preschool children, thus programs are scarce and organization of educational services is nonexistant.

3. Conjunctive parent education programs are necessary for the reinforcement of teaching in areas such as health, nutrition, language development, general attitude toward school and other important goals of the preschool programs.

4. Utilization of the most available sources of outside monies to support preschool and parent education raises some problems but these can be worked out.

5. A significant problem exists regarding the utilization of teachers trained in preschool education. In part, the problem lies in current state certification laws and, in part, with the attitudes of school personnel hiring the teachers for these positions.

6. Operation of quality preschool programs would contribute not only to the education of the young child and his total development, but also would educate his parents in the same areas and release older siblings to attend classes at their own level.

Recommendations

A. Funding.

It is recommended that the state policy which limits and restricts the use of Federal Funds, when they are available for migrant programs, be changed and that state agencies be allowed to apply for the full amount which is available to them under federal allocations.

The State Emergency Board (through administrative policy) has limited the amount of staff that can be employed by the State Department of Education to one administrator and one secretary for maintenance and direction of a program potentially financed in excess of one million dollars. There is considerable evidence that it is necessary to have a staff of five or six to operate a program of that magnitude effectively. Consequently, it is recommended that limitations on staff be adjusted in a manner to permit the director of the program to secure enough qualified people to insure a well-directed program at the state level.

Inasmuch as there are other sources of funds available for special education and innovative educational programs for migrant education, it is recommended that the proposed organization of a Seasonal Agricultural Workers Affairs Board (this information appears elsewhere in the report) be utilized so that resources available from Federal, State, local, and private sources be explored and, where applicable, applied for in order to insure maximum participation and effective use of funds for the education of migrant children and adults.

It is recommended that the state use the maximum resources that are available in funding a comprehensive program rather than trying to limit itself to preconceived programs developed at one level.

B. Planning.

It is recommended that the State Department of Education in cooperation with other relevant private and public agencies develop a long range plan for migrant education which would be part of the state "migrant master plan". Such a plan would include the concepts of preschool through adult education. The plan should include direction for elementary and secondary education as well as vocational and technical education programs. The development of such a plan would entail a cooperative working relationship with private and public agencies currently, or likely to be, involved in migrant education in the future.

C. Teacher Training.

It is recommended that the State Department of Education expand its funding to state institutions to assist them in developing and preparing initial teacher training programs. In addition, the State Department of Education in conjunction with state institutions of higher education should explore other possible outside funding sources to supplement the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Migrant Amendment.

D. Curriculum Development.

It is recommended that the State Department of Education utilize parts of its fund (available through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Migrant Amendment), for curriculum development and that the services of experts in the field be utilized wherever and whenever possible to assist in the development of this curriculum.

E. Basic Research.

It is recommended that the state explore various possibilities of funding basic research regarding seasonal agricultural workers. A contract could be developed for the various state agencies with one agency given the task of pulling the information together.

Another alternative, of course, would be to fund a state university to provide the research related to education programs. This could be coordinated through the Seasonal Agricultural Workers Affairs Board to provide the necessary continuity.

F. Preschool Education.

1. Preschool programs should become an integral part of the total education plan for migrant children and families. These programs should be broadly based in the sense that they attend to the total development of the young child: physical, social, emotional and intellectual.

2. Parent education programs should be run in conjunction with the children's programs and should consider the mother as the target person.

3. Special provisions need to be made to utilize the professionally trained preschool teacher. Presently she is not considered for jobs in our educational system because she is not certified by the state. Since these teachers now must leave the state for employment we lose a great deal of expensive, well-qualified teaching talent.

4. Existing teacher training programs should be encouraged to slant a portion of their training toward work with disadvantaged and minority group children. A variety of other minor changes in training programs could produce well-trained specialists for work with migrant children and families.

IV. SHELTER

The Situation

There are approximately 945 labor camps in Oregon with a total capacity of about 40,018 persons. Approximately 85% of this housing is on farms where agricultural employees work.

State and Federal statutes prescribe minimum housing standards. The standards range from building site and construction materials to health and safety of the occupants. Federal standards must be met before the Employment Service can recruit workers for employers. All operators of farm labor camps in Oregon are required to file a notification of intent to operate a farm labor camp with a local health officer prior to operating the camp for the current year. Appendix IV-1 provides a comparison of state and federal regulations with respect to housing.

Labor camps are presently officially inspected by representatives of the State Department of Employment; State Bureau of Labor, Wages and Hours Division; State Board of Health, Occupational Health Section; and by local health departments. In addition, the Farmers Home Administration makes a minimum of an annual inspection of camps built with FHA loan funds.

Approximately thirty camps were ordered closed for non-compliance by local health officers and sanitarians in 1968. Approximately half of these corrected deficiencies and were reopened.

Housing conditions vary considerably throughout the state. It would be inaccurate to categorize housing conditions in general terms. In some camps, buildings are in excellent condition, particularly those built in the last five to ten years, but water supply, quality, and distribution systems are often inadequate and do not meet standards. On the other hand, some camp buildings are below standards yet water supply, quality, and distribution systems are more than adequate and meet standards. The same parallel can be drawn with respect to other facilities such as sewage disposal, toilets, electricity, and garbage disposal.

Camp conditions do not remain static throughout the period of occupancy. Inspections prior to occupancy often show that facilities meet standards, but during occupancy there is non-compliance in maintenance on the part of owners and occupants.

The cost of housing varies with construction, age, and usage.

The need for living accommodations for seasonally employed agricultural workers varies from year to year, from month to month during the year, and is strongly influenced by demands for workers during peak production and

harvesting periods in several areas in the state. An adequate number of housing units in one season may be woefully inadequate if workers move into a given locality in large numbers to take advantage of a bumper harvest and promise of increased work opportunities.

There is evidence of considerable new construction of on-the-farm housing for workers. The new labor camp at Milton-Freewater is the only recently constructed community or central camp facility built in Oregon. Under Title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended in 1961, the Farmers Home Administration can make long term, low interest loans for farm labor housing construction and improvements on existing facilities. The Milton-Freewater camp project was funded under this act.

Federal and State Regulations

By state law, approved by the Governor on July 6, 1967, all operators of farm labor camps in Oregon are required to file a notification of intent to operate a farm labor camp with their local health officer. The ultimate responsibility for the administration of the provisions of the farm labor camp statute (ORS 446.510) is delegated by law to local health Departments.

Before the State Employment Service can extend its recruitment efforts into interstate sources in behalf of local employers, agricultural labor housing must meet U. S. Department of Labor standards adopted July 17, 1968. See Appendix for a comparison of Federal and State housing standards.

Programs of Nearby States

In the State of Washington, concern about shelter for seasonal agricultural workers has recently manifested itself. The State Health Department has recently revised their labor camp regulations. Governor Evans has recently received a report from a Farm Labor Advisory Commission.

Three counties operate farm labor camps. Grant County has a new camp of pumice block built in 1965 or 1966. Yakima and Walla Walla have camps put in originally by the Farm Security Administration.

Most of the migratory labor housing in Idaho has been constructed and operated by Farm Labor Associations. These associations are made up of farm operators who have organized specifically for the purpose of providing housing for these workers. One political sub-division sponsors migratory worker housing in Idaho. This is the Caldwell Labor Camp, owned and operated by the City of Caldwell. The Mayor appoints a five-member Board who are designated as the "Housing Authority, City of Caldwell." The Amalgamated Sugar Company and the Utah-Idaho Sugar Company both built and operated labor camps for the convenience of their growers; however, their preference is that such housing be provided by the growers.

In the State of California, existing housing has been influenced by the Bracero Program. However, the State has recently been very active in planning an ambitious attack on the problem. The program is best described by a letter from Edmund A. Tworuk, Coordinator, Housing Development, Department of Housing and Community Development, State of California, Sacramento, California.

> "State involvement in rural migrant housing consists largely of the efforts of the State Office of Economic Opportunity and our own Department of Housing and Community Development. Of the two, the state OEO program, known as the California Migrant Master Plan, is the most significant. Enclosed you will find the Second Annual Progress Report which outlines the salient features of this program. Unquestionably, this program has been a definite success in California, but federal funding has not been at a level that would allow the program to meet the total needs in the state. The Migrant Master Plan represents a cooperative endeavor involving the State through its Office of Economic Opportunity Agency, local county government, and local housing authorities with the latter group actually operating the housing centers throughout the State. The housing units created by this program have largely supplanted old and inadequate migrant housing accommodations formerly operated by housing authorities under the 'Farm Center Law.'
>
> "The State Department of Housing and Community Development is engaged in developing rural housing programs throughout California, but for permanent agricultural employees and other rural residents as distinct from migratory workers. However, the state has witnessed some stabilization of migrant workers whereby such workers have become permanent local residents in those areas where decent family housing units are available. In some parts of this state's Central Valley, agricultural employment is available from ten to eleven months of the year and this tends to assist in stabilizing of families. Also, California is facing an increasing use of mechanized equipment in agriculture and this tends to both reduce the need for peak harvest labor and increase the need for stabilized semi-skilled machine operators and maintenance people."

Costs of the California Migrant Master Plan are borne as follows:

	Estimated 1967-68 (Dollars)
State.....	264,023
Federal.....	3,800,024
Total.....	4,064,047

Appendix IV-2 reproduces a memorandum which gives considerable detail on the California program.

Recommendations

1. All labor camps in the state should meet the standards set forth in Oregon Revised Statutes 446.520 - 446.590 before being approved for occupancy. New housing should meet federal standards and older housing should be brought up to this level within five years.

2. Oregon Revised Statutes 446.510 requiring farm labor camp operators to notify local health officers in writing prior to operating a farm labor camp for the current year should be enforced.

3. Housing should be inspected two times during occupancy, as well as prior to occupancy. In order to give the grower time to meet standards and to alleviate seasonal demands on inspecting agencies, it is recommended that the inspection agency be required to inspect a camp within thirty days of the date such inspection is requested by a grower.

4. One agency should be designated to make official camp and field inspections, rather than the three or four that now make inspections. The earlier proposed Seasonal Agricultural Workers Affairs Board or an ad hoc committee, headed by a representative of the Governor's Office should be appointed to develop a recommended procedure whereby the official inspections of one agency can be accepted by the others and fulfill agency requirements. Representatives from the State Departments of Labor, Employment, and Health should serve on this committee. State Health Departments should conduct a periodic audit and inspection throughout the state.

5. An intensive and extensive educational program is needed on the many facets of agricultural labor housing in Oregon.

   a) Employers need to be informed on the economics of providing housing, recommended housing unit designs, building materials, utilities systems, and the rules and regulations governing the operation and maintenance of farm labor camps.

   b) Occupants need to be informed on acceptable conduct while residing in labor camps. They should be given opportunities to learn respect for the property of others, basic health and sanitation practices, the preparation and preservation of wholesome foods, and care of housing utilities and furnishings.

   c) State and community leaders need to be informed on the need for farm labor housing, the social and economic aspects of providing such housing, anticipated future demands for housing and alternative methods of meeting future needs.

6. The State of Oregon should assume leadership and responsibility for the establishment of centralized housing centers strategically

located throughout areas of the state where seasonal agricultural workers are employed. Ninety per cent of the seasonal agricultural workers in Oregon work in the nine counties of Clackamas, Washington, Hood River, Marion, Polk, Linn, Jackson, Klamath, and Malheur. A significant number also work in the tri-county area of Central Oregon; Jefferson, Deschutes, and Crook Counties.

The centers should include areas for family units, single worker units, recreation, laundry, and provision for employment, health, education, and welfare services. Space should also be provided for house trailers, campers, tents, and other portable living units, where such utilities as water, electricity, and sewage and garbage disposal are readily accessible.

It is proposed that capital costs be borne by the State. Effort should be made to explore avenues whereby the Federal Government could share in the construction cost of such facilities. Under existing law, the State of Oregon could not assume debt for the purpose of building such housing. Therefore, Federal lending programs would not be useful in this context. Cost sharing or outright grants from the Federal Government would reduce the demands on the general fund of the State. A charge would be made of occupants and growers to cover the variable costs such as water, electricity, refuse disposal, maintenance, and custodial services. In the event workers wish to remain in the housing longer than the agricultural harvesting season, special arrangements would need to be made. In such an event, all variable costs would be borne by the tenant.

Many growers have invested substantially in worker housing. Such housing could continue to be used, if desired, by both worker and grower. It is also recognized that approximately ten per cent of the intra- and inter-state workers presently use house trailers, campers, and tents. State centralized housing provided under the conditions outlined above would tend to complement existing investment and preserve freedom of choice both on the part of the worker and the grower. Furthermore, state encouragement should be given those workers who wish to provide their own housing.

Information currently available does not permit a precise estimate regarding the amount of housing needed, nor the exact location that would provide the greatest utility. A study should be undertaken as soon as possible to provide information on these items.

V. HEALTH SERVICES AND NUTRITION

Health Services

The Situation and Existing Problems

Seasonal agricultural workers and their families have vital health needs that are not currently being met. There is a need for:

1. Services that would provide immunizations, clinical examinations, laboratory tests, and medical consultation.

2. Diagnostic and treatment services in clinics near the worker's home.

3. Emergency, short-term and long-term hospitalization.

4. Accessible dental care, both of a preventive and corrective nature.

5. Environmental conditions that will make sanitary living conditions possible.

6. Education of workers and their families in sanitary practices and health, generally is also needed.

7. Diets of workers tend to be low in calcium, protein, and Vitamins A and C. Much of this can be attributed to a lack of knowledge regarding essential dietary practices. Alcoholism accounts for some malnutrition.

National health programs such as are promoted by the United States Public Health Service are structured as year-round programs for the general population and are not directed to specific target groups. In addition, the Public Health Service is far removed from the local scene and rarely touches the individual citizen. Federal health programs are largely supporting or back-up services to the state and community health departments and can only have an indirect effect upon seasonal workers and their families.

State health programs directed to the year-round needs of the general public have little relationship to the seasonal agricultural worker and his family. State disease control and pollution abatement programs can have an indirect value to seasonal workers as an incidental part of these programs.

County health programs can serve the individual worker and his family but county-wide, year-round programs cannot effectively include the seasonal worker who may be in the county for a decidedly limited period

of time. To be fully effective in providing essential health services, the county health department must regard the seasonal workers as a special target population and structure a program designed to the specific health needs of the seasonal workers and their families.

Adequate though not complete health services have been provided seasonal workers by county health departments operating under contracts provided through the Federal Migrant Health Act of 1962 and its subsequent continuation and amendment in 1965. Six counties with full-time health departments have "contract" programs and three counties with full-time health departments participate effectively in the program on a non-contract basis. About 90% of seasonal agricultural workers in Oregon and about 85% of the farm labor camps are in these nine counties. Eight counties with full-time health service have no special programs for their small populations of seasonal agricultural workers and their families. The Occupational Health Section of the State Board of Health provides limited health service to counties without established health departments.

Conclusions

1. Seasonal workers receive little benefit from traditional health programs whether these programs are on a federal, state, or county level. Full-time county health departments with "contract" programs have provided an acceptable level of health services to the seasonal worker groups; and other full-time health department non-contract programs also have been effective. Yet, all of these programs can and should be extended and shored up if the seasonal agricultural worker population is to receive the quantity and quality of health services enjoyed by other segments of the state population. Through some means, health services should be provided for seasonal workers in all counties having people in this classification.

2. Because of the limited health understanding of seasonal workers, a certain degree of social engineering must be provided to make certain these people use available health services effectively.

Recommendations

1. The Occupational Health Section, Oregon State Board of Health, should be designed as the state administrative agency responsible for health programs relating to seasonal agricultural workers.

2. Full-time health departments of counties with seasonal workers should be encouraged to submit applications for grants under the Migrant Health Act of 1962 and 1965.

3. Counties without full-time health departments, but with seasonal workers needing health services, should be provided necessary services by the Occupational Health Section, Oregon State Board of Health.

4. Medical services

   a. Physicians services available in evening clinics. These should be financed by the responsible health department.

   b. Office visits upon recommendation of public health nurse. Set fee paid by health department with seasonal worker paying part fee when feasible.

   c. Drugs paid for by health department.

5. Hospitalization

   a. Physician referral. Paid jointly by health department and worker when feasible; otherwise by health department.

   b. Emergency admissions. Paid jointly by health department and worker when feasible; otherwise by health department.

6. Child health

   a. Immunization clinics (near worker homes) provided by county or state health staff members.

   b. Well-child conferences using private practitioner paid by the supervising health agency.

7. Dental health

   a. Two mobile dental units staffed by seniors from the Oregon Dental School (dentists and assistants paid salaries by the State Board of Health).

   b. Use of three available dentist offices staffed by seniors from the Oregon Dental School. (Dentists and assistants paid salaries by the State Board of Health).

   c. Referrals from medical clinics and public health nurses to practicing dentists, costs to be paid jointly by responsible health department and seasonal worker when feasible; otherwise by health department.

8. Public health nurse service

   a. Bilingual nurses when available.

   b. Interpreters be employed when available and necessary.

9. Sanitation inspection and advisory service

   a. Special corps of sanitarians on inspection and advisory detail before and during seasonal employment period.

b. Funds to correct unsanitary public conditions affecting the seasonal worker and family.

c. Field inspections should be under the jurisdiction of the Health Department.

10. Health and nutrition education

a. Special corps of educators to help seasonal workers promote their own health and utilize health services.

b. Special emphasis upon educating seasonal worker families to supplement their traditional diet with foods containing proteins, minerals, and vitamins.

Nutrition

Only meager information is available regarding the nutritional status of seasonal agricultural workers in the state of Oregon. Large numbers of physical examinations have been given in some areas, but apparently the question of nutritional status has not been posed in any systematic way. Information is lacking on both the adult and child populations. It is possible that a good deal of information is already available from the physical examinations administered to the adults and children, but it has not been tabulated.

Experience with other minority and low-income groups would lead one to expect some rather severe nutritional problems in this group, particularly among the young.

Initially, nutritional status in general will need to be assessed and specific needs identified. Then the problem becomes one of education. In such an educational program, the meal planner is the target person and it is reasonable to assume that this person is the mother. No systematic evaluation of prior programs in this area is available; however, among the more successful programs there do seem to be certain elements related to success in changing nutritionally inadequate meal patterns. Among these are:

1) tolerance and empathy for subgroup;

2) active reinforcement of the importance of nutrition; from various sources (nurse, teacher, parent, educator);

3) parent education programs which are tolerant of the strength of food buying and eating patterns;

4) appeals to mothers in terms of the positive effects dietary supplementations and/or changes could have for their children.

It is most encouraging that in this area a rather flexible model is available for implementing the total process: from collecting information about nutritional status to effecting changes in the buying patterns. For example, material developed by the Office of Economic Opportunity provides nutrition information for personnel at a variety of levels:

cook in a Child Development Center,
teacher in the Center,
food buyers supplying groups of programs,
trainers of Head Start Teachers,
auxiliary personnel in educational programs,
parent educators and material for parents.

After needs have been identified, the most qualified teacher would appear to be the Home Economics Nutritional Specialist. A number of these specialists have had considerable experience with groups such as the culturally disadvantaged associated with Office of Economic Opportunity projects. In some areas, professionals from various specialties in Home Economics (nutrition, child development, parent education, family relations) have worked jointly to develop a variety of materials and techniques relating to the education of sub groups such as these seasonal workers.

Conclusions

1. The nutritional status of migrant workers and their children has not been investigated systematically and should be undertaken as soon as possible.

2. The collection of data regarding nutritional status is a relatively straightforward problem. The second and most crucial step of education to eliminate deficiencies is more complex.

3. When findings of prior educational programs with similar groups are generalized, one would expect to find some severe nutritional deficiencies among these seasonal employees particularly among the young.

4. These same programs provide a workable and flexible model for investigating programs for this particular group.

5. The theme which reoccurs in the more successful program is that of attachment to preschool education programs and an interdisciplinary approach to the development of educational materials and techniques. This would seem to insure systematic presentation, reinforcement of ideas, and a broader base for evaluating effectiveness of educational plan.

Recommendations

1. Systematic evaluations of nutritional status of adults and children be included in physical examinations and if these examinations are not given, special provisions should be set up with public health personnel to gather information.

2. Educational programs geared to eliminating the identified deficiencies should be planned as part of the parent education programs and be tied directly to the preschool program. In addition, they should have the mother as the target person, and should be the result of an interdisciplinary effort of various professions concerned.

3. Home Economics Nutrition Specialists should be the communicative instrument for the decisions of the interdisciplinary group.

4. Training for all personnel should include some focus on the elements listed above as being related to the more successful parent education programs in groups similar to these seasonal employees.

5. Special note should be made of an ongoing program sponsored by the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. A survey under the direction of Dr. Arnold Schaeffer is being conducted to identify by clinical, biochemical and dietary procedures the nutritional status of population groups. This will be the first comprehensive nutrition survey in the United States. Apparently, Washington and California are among the ten states now involved. The Governor's Office could point out the need to include Oregon in this survey as soon as possible.

VI. THE ECONOMICS OF CROP PRODUCTION IN OREGON

Crops harvested by seasonal agricultural labor in Oregon enter heavily into interstate commerce. While climatic conditions are often desirable for the production of quality crops, rather long distances have to be overcome to reach markets with heavy population. Because of these great distances, other competing areas have an opportunity to penetrate those markets now served by Oregon farmers. Any cost increase encountered by Oregon farmers that would not apply to producers outside the state would obviously put Oregon farmers at a competitive disadvantage.

One source in the trade apportioned the retail price of 25 cents paid by the consumer for a can of pole snap beans as follows:

Distribution, wholesale & retail ----	12.9 cents
Processing ----------	9.3 cents
To the grower ----------	2.8 cents

Another processor gave information on their pack of strawberries, beans and cherries as follows:

Returns to Growers and Processors

Strawberries

1963	To Growers ----------	Canned	$ 31,017	
		Frozen	256,464	
		Total	$287,481	42.81%
	To Processor ----------	Canned	$ 70,898	
		Frozen	313,167	
		Total	$384,065	57.19%
	Total Processed Value -	Canned	$101,915	
		Frozen	569,631	
		Total	$671,546	100.0%
1967	To Growers ----------	Canned	$ 35,387	
		Frozen	244,465	
		Total	$279,852	49.54%
	To Processor ----------	Canned	$ 69,435	
		Frozen	215,563	
		Total	$284,998	50.46%
	Total Processed Value -	Canned	$104,822	
		Frozen	460,028	
		Total	$564,850	100.0%

Pole Beans

1963	To Growers ----------	Canned	$1,405,098	
		Frozen	142,308	
		Total	$1,547,406	27.97%
	To Processors ---------	Canned	$3,756,536	
		Frozen	228,696	
		Total	$3,985,232	72.03%
	Total Processed Value -		$5,532,638	100.0%
1967	To Growers ----------	Canned	$1,840,108	
		Frozen	43,874	
		Total	$1,883,982	28.58%
	To Processors ---------	Canned	$4,655,377	
		Frozen	51,974	
		Total	$4,707,351	71.42%
	Total Processed Value -		$6,591,333	100.0%

Cherries

1963	To Growers ------	Sweet Canned	$ 8,187	
		Sour Canned	22,240	
		Total	$ 30,427	37.92%
	To Processors ---	Sweet Canned	$ 20,229	
		Sour Canned	29,595	
		Total	$ 49,824	62.08%
	Total Processed Value -		$ 80,251	100.0%
1967	To Growers ------	Sweet Canned	$131,359	
		Sour Canned	97,251	
		Total	$228,610	44.62%
	To Processors ---	Sweet Canned	$183,084	
		Sour Canned	100,659	
		Total	$283,743	55.38%
	Total Processed Value -		$512,353	100.0%

Prices of agricultural products fluctuate greatly from year to year. This is a result of fluctuations in size of crop usually caused by unpredictable climatic and other production conditions. Even allowing for fluctuation in size of crop, it is apparent from Appendix Table VI-1 that most agricultural product prices have not increased as much as other prices or have declined in a period of rising prices generally. Strawberries, snap beans and sweet cherries are heavy users of seasonal agricultural labor. 1967 price as a percentage of 1958 price was 117, 91 and 120 respectively.

Harvest costs amount to a significant percentage of total cost and of the price received by farmers. A field survey was made of 26 Willamette Valley snap bean growers. The following results were obtained:

Picking costs ----------	$0.0313 per pound
All other costs ---------	0.0078 per pound
Total costs-----	$0.0391 per pound

Picking costs include the bussing of pickers, supervisory labor, housing for migrant workers, and supplies. The average 1966 price to growers was $0.056 per pound.

Appendix Tables VI-2 through VI-13 give production acreage and farm number trends for the principal crops using seasonal agricultural labor. Study of these trends reveals (1) Oregon production of these high-value crops is increasing, (2) Oregon farmers are coming under increasing competitive pressure as indicated by the decreasing number of farmers. In particular, small and medium-sized farms have been hard hit by this competitive pressure.

Conclusions

1. Farmers receive less than half of the price paid by retailers and consumers for most farm crops using season agricultural labor.

2. Grower returns have declined, and competitive pressure has forced many growers to quit farming.

3. Despite this competitive pressure, average and total production of high-value fruit and vegetable crops have increased in Oregon.

4. A significant increase in wages for seasonal agricultural labor in Oregon alone would:

   A. Fall largely on the cost structure of the individual farmer and would not be passed on to the consumer;

   B. Tend to worsen the competitive position of Oregon producers;

C. Tend to reduce employment opportunities in the state for lower relative to higher quality labor.

5. The problem of more adequate compensation for seasonal agricultural workers cannot be solved on a product-by-product or state-by-state basis. There are valid social reasons for viewing the problem on an over-all basis. The economics of the problem tends to suggest such a viewpoint.

APPENDIX I-1

ESTIMATED LABOR FORCE IN OREGON

	Number of Workers	
Year	Non-Agriculture	Agriculture
1958	567,600	76,700
1959	593,900	78,300
1960	606,100	76,200
1961	607,900	71,400
1962	625,700	69,300
1963	647,100	65,600
1964	675,600	62,400
1965	714,200	61,600
1966	746,700	60,600
1967	757,100	60,200
1968		

SOURCE: Oregon Department of Labor

APPENDIX I-2

ESTIMATED SEASONAL HIRED FARM WORK FORCE EMPLOYED

ON JUNE 15, 1958 THROUGH 1968 BY TYPE OF WORKER

(STATE TOTALS)

Date	Total Seasonal Employment	Local Workers	% of Total	Intrastate Migratory	% of Total	Interstate Migratory	% of Total
6-15-58	65,845	50,225	76	4,110	6	11,510	18
6-15-59	57,975	43,570	75	2,965	5	11,440	20
6-15-60	80,645	66,365	82	2,855	4	11,425	14
6-15-61	62,285	48,770	78	3,415	6	10,100	16
6-15-62	46,210	38,200	83	1,360	3	6,650	14
6-15-63	51,500	38,425	75	2,140	4	10,935	21
6-15-64	31,655	25,035	79	830	3	5,790	18
6-15-65	59,330	46,565	78	2,270	4	10,495	18
6-15-66	74,030	56,830	77	2,525	3	14,675	20
6-15-67	64,835	51,575	80	2,140	3	11,120	17
6-15-68	62,910	50,825	81	1,850	3	10,235	16
11 Year Average	59,745	46,945	79	2,405	4	10,395	17

SOURCE: Oregon State Employment Service

APPENDIX I-3

ESTIMATED SEASONAL HIRED FARM WORK FORCE EMPLOYED

ON JUNE 30, 1958 THROUGH 1968 BY TYPE OF WORKER

(STATE TOTALS)

Date	Total Seasonal Employment	Local Workers	% of Total	Intrastate Migratory	% of Total	Interstate Migratory	% of Total
6-30-58	41,515	24,825	60	3,730	9	12,960	31
6-30-59	71,480	51,265	72	4,780	7	15,435	21
6-30-60	69,780	54,100	78	2,850	4	12,830	18
6-30-61	72,400	52,910	73	2,805	4	16,685	23
6-30-62	84,040	64,025	76	3,055	4	16,960	20
6-30-63	63,940	45,525	71	2,540	4	15,875	25
6-30-64	90,910	73,475	81	2,920	3	14,515	16
6-30-65	63,360	48,845	77	2,025	3	12,490	20
6-30-66	76,945	54,465	71	3,145	4	19,335	25
6-30-67	84,825	61,785	73	2,905	3	20,135	24
6-30-68	76,945	64,055	83	1,920	3	10,970	14
11 Year Average	72,375	54,115	75	2,970	4	15,290	21

SOURCE: Oregon State Employment Service

APPENDIX I-4

ESTIMATED SEASONAL HIRED FARM WORK FORCE EMPLOYED

ON AUGUST 15, 1958 THROUGH 1968 BY TYPE OF WORKER

(STATE TOTALS)

Date	Total Seasonal Employment	Local Workers	% of Total	Intrastate Migratory	% of Total	Interstate Migratory	% of Total
8-15-58	50,390	37,330	74	3,670	7	9,390	19
8-15-59	58,525	44,780	76	3,940	7	9,805	17
8-15-60	63,410	46,730	74	2,025	3	14,655	23
8-15-61	74,825	56,960	76	1,790	2	16,075	22
8-15-62	71,700	48,315	67	3,660	5	19,725	28
8-15-63	74,915	54,385	73	3,370	4	17,160	23
8-15-64	61,650	45,790	75	2,680	4	13,180	21
8-15-65	63,580	48,105	76	2,060	3	13,415	21
8-15-66	76,865	57,415	75	2,655	3	16,795	22
8-15-67	68,465	52,535	76	2,470	4	13,460	20
8-15-68	68,730	55,380	81	2,375	3	10,975	16
11 Year Average	66,640	49,795	75	2,790	4	14,055	21

SOURCE: Oregon State Employment Service